

### III. REMARKS

The Examiner has rejected claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, because the language of claim 1, as originally filed, uses the word "means" but not in the phrase "means for". The applicant submits that the rejection is improper (and should be withdrawn). The obligation of applicants to define their inventions precisely, that arises from 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, has never been held or interpreted as requiring the applicant to only use the word "means" in the phrase "means for" within claim language. Moreover, the use of the word "means" in claim 1 is such that one skilled in the art would clearly understand the scope of what is being claimed. Nonetheless, claim 1 has been amended to delete the word "means" to expedite prosecution. The amendment is not made for patentability reasons.

Claim 1-6 have been rejected on the ground of non-statutory obviousness type double patenting in view of claims in US Patent 7,047,984. Appended hereto is a Terminal Disclaimer.

Claims 1-6 have been rejected under 35 USC 102 as being anticipated by WO 02/01292. The Applicants disagree. Claim 1 recites that, the first opening of the cleaning chamber (for introducing and removing a reticle from the cleaning chamber) and the feed side (of the detection unit) lie on opposite sides of the cleaning chamber from each other. This does not appear to be disclosed in the publication of WO 02/01292. As seen in Fig. 1, the cleaning device 5 and detection device 6 are one above another with the respective feed openings of each on the same side of the cleaning device 5. Claim 1-6 are patentable over the noted publication.

Claims 1-5 have been rejected under 35 USC 102 as being anticipated by Jackson. The Applicants disagree. Claim 1 calls for a detection/cleaning device for reticles. Though this language is in the preamble, it may not be properly ignored as it sets forth structural features of the device (e.g. reticles are positioned in substantial contact with the semiconductor substrate during processing, and hence an open architecture processing apparatus, such as shown in Fig. 4A in Jackson is not suitable structurally as a device for detection/cleaning reticles as called for in claim 1). Further claim 1 calls for a closable housing, and the cleaning unit inside the closable housing in combination with the aforementioned features. This is not disclosed anywhere in Jackson. Claims 1-6 are patentable.

Claim 7 has been added claiming further features of the applicants' invention as described in the Specification and shown in the drawings. No new matter has been added.

For all of the foregoing reasons, it is respectfully submitted that all of the claims now present in the application are clearly novel and patentable over the prior art of record, and are in proper form for allowance. Accordingly, favorable reconsideration and allowance is respectfully requested. Should any unresolved issues remain, the Examiner is invited to call Applicants' attorney at the telephone number indicated below.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge payment for a any extension of time and any fees associated with this communication or credit any over payment to Deposit Account No. 16-1350.

Respectfully submitted,

2  
Janik Marcovici  
Reg. No. 42,841  
Perman & Green, LLP  
425 Post Road  
Fairfield, CT 06824  
(203) 259-1800  
Customer No.: 2512

1/26/07  
Date

**CERTIFICATE OF MAILING**

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service on the date indicated below as first class mail in an envelope addressed to the Mail Stop Amendment, Commissioner of Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450.

Date: 1/26/07

Signature: Carolina Rodriguez  
Person Making Deposit